

Appl. No. 09/846,115

PATENT

The teachings of Dietz convert phrases in one language into a multitude of different languages. This is inherently different than Applicant's claimed invention because the claimed invention results in an expression such as character gender, character condition or character environment being applied while leaving the language unchanged. For example, relying on Dietz, a phrase entered uttered in English would be translated into a different language. Applicant's claimed invention would result in a phrase, still in English, but with an applied expression such as character gender, character condition, or character environment.

In response to Examiner's arguments on Page 7 of the Office Action mailed March 30, 2006 please note that in the Amendment dated December 19, 2005 Applicant amended the independent claims to include the term "expression", specifically,

"...the output characteristics identifying an *expression* to be applied to the content data..."

The inclusion of a portion of the as-filed application in the Remarks section of the response was intended to assist the Examiner in finding support for the amendment of the claims. As currently filed, the features upon which Applicant relies (i.e., the *term* "expression") is present in all of the independent claims. As argued above, the term "expression" cannot be perceived as analogous with the term "translate" as taught by Dietz.

Additional Remarks

Applicant's claimed invention is further distinguishable from Dietz because the content data of Applicant's claimed invention is outputted from the second computer as audio data, including the applied expression. The claimed invention results in the content data being

Attorney Docket No. SONYP009

2

Appl. No. 09/846,115

PATENT

synthesized into audio data that includes the applied expression that is to be outputted by the second computer. This is unlike what is described in Dietz. In Dietz the first computer is used to input the data. The inputted data is translated into a different language by the second computer, and the translated language is sent back to the first computer where it is either heard as audio output or displayed textually.

The difference between Applicant's claimed invention and Dietz can be seen in the following example. With Dietz, one can envision a user standing on a street corner in a foreign country asking a local person how to get to the closest coffee shop. The input device, or first computer, of Dietz allows a user to speak a phrase that is translated by the second computer. The translation is sent back to the first computer so the local person can either hear or read the translated phrase. This application, where the translation is sent back to the first computer, does not teach nor suggest Applicant's claimed invention. The claimed invention results in the audio data with the applied expression being audible to a user of the second computer.